



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/253,048	02/19/1999	YASUHIITO INAGAKI	9792909-4094	5170

26263 7590 06/14/2010  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. BOX 061080  
WACKER DRIVE STATION, WILLIS TOWER  
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER
----------

MARKOFF, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1711

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/14/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/253,048	<b>Applicant(s)</b> INAGAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Alexander Markoff	<b>Art Unit</b> 1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 42-48, 50, 51, 55 and 57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 42-48, 50, 51, 55 and 57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1711

4. Claims 42, 44, 48, 50, 51 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52—063189 and Sugo et al (US Patent NO 5,783,608).

JP 55-157604 teaches a method comprising providing an agent comprising a polymer as claimed, which is treated as claimed and using the agent for absorbing different substances.

The polymer is disclosed as acrylonitrile-styrene copolymer with concentration of acrylonitrile in the claimed range (20-30%).

The polymer is treated with sulfuric acid to hydrolyze acrylonitrile units and sulfonate the styrene units.

JP 55-157604 teaches the use of the agent for absorbing odor-emitting substances, as an absorbent agent, as useful for sanitary goods, etc.

JP 55-157604 does not specifically teach the use of the agent for absorbing ammonia or heavy metals.

However, JP 52-063189 and Sugo et al teach that it was known to use similar polymers, which were similarly functionalized polymers for absorbing heavy and radioactive metals and ammonia. See entire documents, especially abstract of the JP document, and abstract and column 6, line 60 - column 7, line 6 of Sugo et al.

The documents teach absorption from liquids and gasses.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to use the agent of JP 55-157604 for absorption of ammonia and/or heavy

Art Unit: 1711

metals from liquids or gases with reasonable expectation of adequate results because JP 52-063189 and Sugo et al teach that it was known to use similar polymers, which were similarly functionalized polymers for absorbing heavy and radioactive metals and ammonia.

5. Claims 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52—063189 and Sugo et al, further in view of Grant et al (US Patent NO 5,242,503).

JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52—063189 and Sugo et al does not specifically teach application of the cleaning agent to a solid soil material.

However, Grant et al teach removal contamination as claimed from the solid soil with ion exchange resins.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to use functionalized resins of the JP 55-157604 in the method of Grant et al with reasonable expectation of adequate results because JP 52—063189 and Sugo et al teach that it was known to use the resin, which are similarly functionalized as the resins of JP 55-157604 for removal the same contaminants as recited by Grant et al.

6. Claims 43 and 57 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 55-157604 in view of JP 52—063189 and Sugo et al, further in view of Rodman (US Patent No 3,375,933).

Art Unit: 1711

JP 55-157604 modified JP 52—063189 and Sugo et al does not specifically teach the use of a column to facilitate the contact of the agent with the waste water and molding of the functionalized resin with a plastic.

Rodman teaches that it was known in the art to mold the exchange resins with plastic to improve efficiency of the resins.

Rodman also shows a column as a conventional way to contact the fluid to be cleaned with a cleansing agent.

See entire document, especially columns 1 and 2, column 3, lines 15-31, column 4, line 73 – column 5, line 15, Table 1, Figure 3 and the related description.

It would have been obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to employ the conventional means disclosed by Rodman in the method of JP 55-157604 modified by JP 52—063189 and Sugo et al for their primary purpose to contact the water or gas to be cleaned with the cleansing agent with reasonable expectation of success.

It would have also be obvious to an ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to mold the exchange resin with a plastic as suggested by Rodman in the modified method of JP 55-157604 Rodman teaches that such would increase the efficiency of the cleaning.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3/3/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicants allege that JP 55-157604 does not teach or fairly suggest the mol% of at least one styrene or conjugated diene as required by the claims.

This is not persuasive.

In contrast to the applicants' not supported allegation JP 55-157604 teaches the mol% of at least one styrene or conjugated diene as claimed (at least Application Examples 1-8, wherein the concentrations of 70 and 75% of styrene are exemplified, and Scope of Patent Claims).

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Markoff whose telephone number is 571-272-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Art Unit: 1711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alexander Markoff  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1711

/Alexander Markoff/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1711